

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the office action dated June 28, 2006. In the office action, claims 1–5, 7–11, 13–14 and 16–20 were rejected. Claims 6, 12 and 15 were objected to. A detailed discussion of each item in the office action follows.

THE DRAWINGS

In items 2 of the office action, the Examiner noted that in figure 10, the 72 was used for two separate items. The transparent plate in figure 10 has been renumbered from 72 to 73. A replacement formal drawing is attached to this amendment. No other changes have been made to the figure. In addition, paragraph [0073] was also amended to reflect the numeral change for the transparent plate. Applicant's Attorney believes that based on the changes to the drawings and the specification, this basis of rejection has been overcome.

THE ABSTRACT

In item 3 of the office action, the abstract was objected to. The abstract has been amended to correct the errors per the Examiner's instructions.

THE SPECIFICATION

In items 4–5 of the office action, the specification was subjected to because of numerous typographical errors. During the conversion process from the original draft of the application which was in WordPerfect format to do Microsoft Word format which was submitted, special characters such as apostrophes and quote signs were converted into erroneous characters and went unnoticed. Applicant's Attorney has carefully reviewed the entire specification and made corrections as appropriate. In addition, Applicant's Attorney has made the corrections listed by the Examiner. Applicant's Attorney believes that all of the errors in the specification have been corrected and this basis of rejection has been overcome.

In items 6–7 of the office action, claims 10–12 and 14–17 objected to as failing to conform to the invention is set forth in the specification. Applicant’s Attorney has reviewed the specification and claims, and amended both where necessary to ensure that the term “lateral camera assembly support” was used consistently throughout.

THE CLAIM OBJECTIONS

In items 8–9 of the office action, claims 1–20 were objected to. Claims 1–12 and 17–18 were amended by the Examiner’s instructions. Applicant’s Attorney believes that based on the amendment to the claims, this basis of rejection has been overcome.

THE 102(b) REJECTION

In items 9–10 of the office action, claims 1–5, 7–9, 13–14, 16 and 18–19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Reed. However, the Examiner indicated that claim 6 has allowable subject matter. Applicant’s Attorney has canceled claim 6 and Incorporated the limitations of claim 6 into independent claim 1. Based on the amendment to independent claim 1, Applicant’s Attorney believes that the rejection of claims 1–5, 7–9, 13–14 and 16 has been overcome.

Independent claim 18 is also amended to include limitations of claim 6. In particular, the use of a single knob to, by switching from a first or second position, selectively control a gear transmission that drives longitudinal and lateral movement of the video camera. Based on the amendment to independent claim 18, Applicant’s Attorney believes that the rejection of claims 18–19 has been overcome.

THE 103 REJECTION

In items 11–13 of the office action, claims 10–11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103, as being unpatentable over Reed in view of Koshiyouji. In addition, claims 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103, as being unpatentable over Reed in view of Fujioka. Based on the amendments to independent claims 1 and 18, which now incorporate the limitations of claim 6, Applicant's Attorney believes that this basis of rejection has been overcome.

THE ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Regarding item 14 of the office action, the Examiner indicated that claims 6, 12 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicant's Attorney has incorporated the limitations of claim 6 into independent claims 1 and 18. Based on this amendment, claims 1–5 and 7–20 should now be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's Attorney thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's help in prosecuting this invention. In response to the office action, Applicant's Attorney has amended the specification, the abstract, the drawings, and claims 1–5, 7–12 and 17–18; and canceled claim 6. Regarding the drawings, figure 10 was amended to change the number 72 points to the transparent plate to the number 73. No other changes were made. Applicant's Attorney has been careful to avoid the introduction of new matter. In addition, a separate petition and fee for a two month extension of time is attached. Applicant's Attorney believes that all items in the office action dated June 28, 2006 have been addressed, and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the claims, as amended, with a view towards allowance. Applicant's Attorney further invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's Attorney for a telephonic interview at the

below listed number if the Examiner believes that prosecution of the application can be furthered by so doing.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


John C. Smith, Reg. No. 33,284

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, or uploaded to the United States Patent and Trademark Office via the USPTO EFS web site, or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on: 11/27/2006
Deposit Date


John C. Smith, Reg. No. 33,284

11/27/2006
Signature Date